

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 23 2006

## REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in the application.

In the office action, claims 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2002/70958 to Yeo et al. And claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yeo in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,909,439 to Kuwabara.

Yeo appears to generally relate to the reception of video signal, and provides only a device having a single video input. In contrast, claim 12 recites: "A frame forwarding installation for receiving frames... from a plurality of paths." Thus the device of Yeo does not appear to teach this element of the device of claim 12.

Further, the visual program summary device of Yeo does not store an identifier of the frame that has been transmitted to the destination terminal in the storage unit. Still further, because Yeo does not teach a device capable of storing an identifier, it is similarly not capable of determining whether a newly received frame has already been stored in the storage unit so as to discard the received frame or transmit it to the destination terminal.

For at least these reasons it is believed that independent claim 12, patentably distinguishes over the relied upon portions of Yeo and is allowable. As the relied upon portions of Kuwabara do not overcome these shortcomings claims 13-15, which depend from claim 12 are allowable therewith.

Claim 1-3, 5-7, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,883,891 to Williams in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,275,471 to Bushmitch. And claims 4, 8 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams in view of Bushmitch and further view of Kuwabara.

As best understood, Williams teaches three ways of reducing delay when transferring data, dedicated transmission lines, a permanent virtual circuit, when real-time data is to be transmitted, and redundant transmission of critical information.

Applicant's claims 1, and 5 describe, for example, an application discriminating unit for referring to the header of the received frame and determining whether an application of a host layer in the transmitting terminal is a real-time application.

Applicant's claim 9 describes an address-match discriminating unit for determining whether the destination address or transmission-source address contained in the header of the received frame matches an address that has already been registered.

The portions of Williams relied upon in the office action do not teach either a step or means for determining these aspects of the data being transmitted by reference to the header.

Moreover, the relied upon portions of Williams refers to "redundant" data transmission. Those portions of Williams do not state that the frames are sent on parallel paths in the direction of the destination. Redundant can also mean that the data is simply retransmitted over the same path. Thus data transmission can be redundant without being made in parallel with one another.

Still further, Williams teaches away from "redundant" transmission as that term is used therein and therefore provides the matrix based solution whereby lost bits can be restored without the need for additional transmission, thus reducing latency. (See abstract) Thus it is respectfully submitted that Williams actually teaches away from "sending in duplicate the received frame to a plurality of paths in parallel." Accordingly, it is submitted that independent claims 1, 5, and 9 patentably distinguish over the relied upon portions of Williams, whether used alone or in combination with Bushmitch and/or Kuwabara. Therefore claims 1, 5 and 9 are

allowable. Claims 2-4, 6-8, and 10 which depend from one of these allowable base claims are allowable therewith.

Finally, the office action rejects claims 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams in view of Bushmitch and further view of Yeo.

As claims 16-18 recite one or more of the features discussed above in connection with claims 1, 5, 9, and 11, it is submitted that claims 16-18 are also allowable.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,



Nathan Weber  
Reg. No. 50,958

**CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304**

Telephone: (212) 940-8800

Fax: (212) 940-8986/8987

Docket No.: FUSA 17.211 (100807-16871)

NDW:fd